

SENATE RECORD VOTE ANALYSIS

104th Congress
1st Session

Vote No. 418

September 13, 1995, 12:09 p.m.
Page S-13495 Temp. Record

WELFARE REFORM ACT/Title V of the Older Americans Act

SUBJECT: Family Self-Sufficiency Act of 1995 . . . H.R. 4. Mikulski amendment No. 2668 to the Dole modified perfecting amendment No. 2280 to the committee substitute amendment.

ACTION: AMENDMENT AGREED TO, 55-45

SYNOPSIS: As reported with a committee substitute amendment, H.R. 4, the Family Self-Sufficiency Act of 1995, will overhaul six of the Nation's ten largest welfare programs.

The Dole modified perfecting amendment would strike the provisions of the committee substitute amendment and insert in lieu thereof substitute provisions, entitled "The Work Opportunity Act of 1995."

The Mikulski amendment would strike the Dole amendment's repeal of the Senior Community Service Employment Program of title V of the Older Americans Act. (The Dole amendment would rescind the program but would provide its funding as part of a block grant and would require States to meet benchmarks for providing job opportunities for the elderly; how States met those benchmarks would be up to them; they could continue the Senior Community Service Employment Program without Federal administration or they could use alternate methods.)

Those favoring the amendment contended:

The Mikulski amendment would exempt title V of the Older Americans Act from being rolled into a new Federal job training block grant program with 85 other Federal job programs, as proposed by the Dole amendment. This protection is deserved. Title V, or the Senior Community Service Employment Program, finds community service jobs for low-income elderly workers, 81 percent of whom are over 60 years of age. These subsidized workers serve in public schools, child care centers, libraries, and similar places of public need. Without this program, it is very difficult for senior citizens to find employment and contribute to their communities. This program has had incredible success and should not be abandoned in the name of reform. We therefore urge adoption of the amendment.

(See other side)

YEAS (55)			NAYS (45)		NOT VOTING (0)	
Republicans (9 or 17%)	Democrats (46 or 100%)		Republicans (45 or 83%)	Democrats (0 or 0%)	Republicans (0)	Democrats (0)
Campbell	Akaka	Inouye	Abraham	Hutchison		
Cohen	Baucus	Johnston	Ashcroft	Inhofe		
Craig	Biden	Kennedy	Bennett	Jeffords		
Grassley	Bingaman	Kerrey	Bond	Kassebaum		
Hatfield	Boxer	Kerry	Brown	Kyl		
Kempthorne	Bradley	Kohl	Burns	Lott		
Pressler	Breaux	Lautenberg	Chafee	Lugar		
Snowe	Bryan	Leahy	Coats	Mack		
Specter	Bumpers	Levin	Cochran	McCain		
	Byrd	Lieberman	Coverdell	McConnell		
	Conrad	Mikulski	D'Amato	Murkowski		
	Daschle	Moseley-Braun	DeWine	Nickles		
	Dodd	Moynihan	Dole	Packwood		
	Dorgan	Murray	Domenici	Roth		
	Exon	Nunn	Faircloth	Santorum		
	Feingold	Pell	Frist	Shelby		
	Feinstein	Pryor	Gorton	Simpson		
	Ford	Reid	Gramm	Smith		
	Glenn	Robb	Grams	Stevens		
	Graham	Rockefeller	Gregg	Thomas		
	Harkin	Sarbanes	Hatch	Thompson		
	Heflin	Simon	Helms	Thurmond		
	Hollings	Wellstone		Warner		

EXPLANATION OF ABSENCE:

- 1—Official Business
- 2—Necessarily Absent
- 3—Illness
- 4—Other

SYMBOLS:

- AY—Announced Yea
- AN—Announced Nay
- PY—Paired Yea
- PN—Paired Nay

Those opposing the amendment contended:

Senators should not be misled into believing this amendment is about preserving jobs for older Americans. Under the Dole amendment, every senior program currently funded under the Older Americans Act could still be funded. In fact, we fully expect that funding for such programs would increase markedly. The difference is that the Dole amendment would greatly reduce administrative costs. At present, every penny that goes to the senior employment programs under title V is filtered through 10 national contractors. These contractors are given this money to distribute without any competition--the funds are earmarked. According to the General Accounting Office, these organizations are extremely wasteful. Of the \$320 million given last year to help senior citizens get jobs, these contractors spent \$64 million on administrative costs. Under the Dole amendment, none of that \$64 million would be wasted on national contractors. The money would go straight to the States. Local senior groups would be able to lobby their State Governments directly for funds, instead of trying to receive funding from national contractors based in Washington. We are certain that States would be more responsive to local needs, and that funding for such senior employment programs as Green Thumb would increase. Therefore, a vote for the Mikulski amendment is not a vote for senior citizens; it is a vote against them and in favor of certain large, national contractors. We urge our colleagues to side with senior citizens by voting against the Mikulski amendment.